

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/533,994	05/0	5/2005	D. Stephen Lane	00839-03	2589	
34444	7590	02/14/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	TY OF VIR	MRUK, E	MRUK, BRIAN P			
	MAIN STREE TESVILLE, V	ET, SUITE 300 VA 22902		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			1751		

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/533,994	LANE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian P. Mruk	1751	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence ad	ldress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABAND	TION. De timely filed  from the mailing date of this of the control of the contro	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 M.</u> 2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This      3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters,		e merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-82 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-82 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration. r election requirement.		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine  10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 05 May 2005 is/are: a)  Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct  11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. ion is required if the drawing(s) i	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 C	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Appli rity documents have been rec u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National	Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		nary (PTO-413) ail Date nal Patent Application (PT0	O-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/533,994 Page 2

Art Unit: 1751

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

## Claim Objections

2. Claims 65, 69-73 and 77-81 are objected to because of the following informalities: In instant claims 65, 69-73 and 77-81, the phrase "The method of" should be amended to recite "The composition of", since independent claims 60, 66 and 74 are drawn to composition claims, and not method claims. Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/533,994 Page 3

Art Unit: 1751

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Bennet, WO 01/40547.

Bennett, WO 01/40547, discloses a method for the cathodic protection of concrete (see abstract) comprising adding a lithium salt, such as lithium nitrate, into the

Art Unit: 1751

cementitous grout or mortar (see page 7, lines 8-27). It is further taught by Bennett that the lithium nitrate is added in a concentration of about 0.05 to 1.0 grams (dry basis) per cubic centimeter of grout (see page 13, lines 19-27), per the requirements of the instant invention. Specifically, note Examples 1-3. Therefore, instant claims 1-82 are anticipated by Bennet, WO 01/40547.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions.

6. Claims 1-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Bennett, U.S. Patent No. 6,033,553.

Bennett, U.S. Patent No. 6,033,553, discloses a method for the cathodic protection of concrete (see abstract) comprising adding a lithium salt, such as lithium nitrate, into the concrete (see col. 3, lines 10-45). It is further taught by Bennett that the lithium nitrate is added in a concentration of about 10 to 400 grams (dry basis) per square meter of concrete (see col. 6, lines 35-54), per the requirements of the instant invention. Specifically, note Examples 1-2. Therefore, instant claims 1-82 are anticipated by Bennet, U.S. Patent No. 6,033,553.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce

Art Unit: 1751

the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions.

7. Claims 1-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Bennett, U.S. Patent No. 6,217,742.

Bennett, U.S. Patent No. 6,217,742, discloses a method for the cathodic protection of concrete (see abstract) comprising adding a lithium salt, such as lithium nitrate, into the cementitous grout or mortar (see col. 3, lines 25-55). It is further taught by Bennett that the lithium nitrate is added in a concentration of about 0.2-2.0 grams (dry basis) per cubic centimeter of hardened grout or mortar (see col. 5, line 45-col. 6, line 4), per the requirements of the instant invention. Specifically, note Example 1. Therefore, instant claims 1-82 are anticipated by Bennet, U.S. Patent No. 6,217,742.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions.

8. Claims 1-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Stokes et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,022,408.

Stokes et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,022,408, discloses a process for making cement and concrete, such as gravel, sand, crushed stone, and Portland cement (see abstract and col. 1, lines 20-30) comprising adding a lithium containing material, such as lithium nitrate, to the cement, heating the cement to form a clinker, and cooling the clinker (see col. 4, line 45-col. 5, line 59). It is further taught by Stokes et al that the lithium containing compound is added into the cement in an amount sufficient to provide a molar ratio of lithium to sodium equivalent in the resultant clinker of 0.1:1 to 10:1 (see col. 5, lines 8-17), per the requirements of the instant invention. Specifically, note Examples 1-4. Therefore, instant claims 1-82 are anticipated by Stokes et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,022,408.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions.

9. Claims 1-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Foltz et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,985,011.

Foltz et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,985,011, discloses a process and composition for controlling damage in cementitious materials (see abstract) comprising adding a lithium containing material, such as lithium nitrate, to the cementitious material (see col. 3, line 10-col. 4, line 12). It is further taught by Foltz et al that the cementitious material

Art Unit: 1751

includes all hydraulic cements, such as Portland cement, fly ash, pozzolans, slag, and metakaolin (see col. 4, line 61-col. 5, line 3), and that the lithium containing compound is added into the cement in an amount of 0.01-15 molar (see col. 5, lines 30-38), per the requirements of the instant invention. Specifically, note Examples 1-3. Therefore, instant claims 1-82 are anticipated by Foltz et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,985,011.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Mruk whose telephone number is (571) 272-1321. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs (7:00AM-5:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/533,994 Page 8

Art Unit: 1751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BPM Brian P Mruk February 11, 2006 Brian P. Mruk
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751